

Date: Fri, 19 Aug 94 04:30:13 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #381
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Fri, 19 Aug 94 Volume 94 : Issue 381

Today's Topics:

Code Must GO! or stay!?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 18 Aug 1994 14:30:08
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
sundog.tiac.net!news.sprintlink.net!indirect.com!s146.phxslip.indirect.com!
lenwink@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Code Must GO! or stay!?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>Do you pay union scale for air time? What is the format of the discussion?
NOBODY gets paid to do the show, Clay, NOT even me! The show is to
advance the hobby/service of amateur radio, as far as I'm concerned.
I have received many replies PRO-CODE, but I haven't even received
one reply from a person willing to be on the show against the CODE.
How verrrry interesting!
73, Len,
KB7LPW

Date: 18 Aug 1994 21:16:28 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!
news.tamu.edu!furuta@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <lenwink.173.0007B12B@indirect.com>,
<1994Aug15.183558.1@aspen.uml.edu>, <lenwink.180.00086E40@indirect.com>ruta
Subject : Re: Slow Code Idea by Wayne Green

In article <lenwink.180.00086E40@indirect.com>,
Len Winkler <lenwink@indirect.com> wrote:
>And another problem that will rear it's ugly head all too soon....The 10
>year license renewals are here now and it is expected by many that the
>number of licensed hams will shrink from more than 635,000 to around
>400,000 or less! That's a full 1/3 loss. If that occurs, you'll find MANY
>cutbacks and MORE from current manufacturers, price increases, and
>since we have even fewer names on the rolls, possibly more loss of
>spectrum.

I don't understand why a loss of numbers on paper will affect the
manufacturers' business plans. People on the rolls but not active already
aren't buying equipment. They have no effect on the market.

> Plus, over 55% of the licensed hams would be no-code techs!
>How's that for something to think about?

Is this true, or would it be more accurate to say "over 55% of the licensed
hams entered the hobby as no-code techs"? My understanding was that there is a
healthy upgrade rate with the new technicians.

--Rick
KE3IV

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #381
